



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,382	01/29/2001	Jong S. Huang	MCS-057-00	1184

27662 7590 07/26/2005  
LYON & HARR, LLP  
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 800  
OXNARD, CA 93036

EXAMINER
----------

STERRETT, JONATHAN G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3623

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/772,382

**Applicant(s)**

HUANG ET AL.

**Examiner**

Jonathan G. Sterrett

**Art Unit**

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This **Final Office Action** is responsive to applicant's amendment filed April 29, 2005. Applicant's amendment of January 31, 2005 amended **Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14-26 and 28 and cancelled Claim 8**. Applicant's supplementary amendment of April 4, 2005, amended **Claim 1** and added new **Claims 29-32**. Currently **Claims 1-7 and 9-32** are pending.

### *Response to Amendments*

2. The objections for minor informalities to **Claims 6, 10, 21 and 25** are withdrawn.
3. The rejection of **Claims 1-21 and 26-28** under 35 USC 112 is withdrawn.

### *Response to Arguments*

4. Applicant's arguments filed on January 31, 2005 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Applicant's first argument is that a combination of Bayer and LOC stated in the first office action does not disclose the claimed limitation of "tabulating in memory cached votes to generate intermediate voting results at specified intervals". This claimed feature is fully disclosed by an obvious combination of Bayer in view of Oracle 8i. Bayer teaches internet voting where users can cast votes that are directly tabulated by the database. Oracle 8i teaches using objects cached in memory to dramatically speed up database access. The duration at which the cache empties itself by writing to the database the data it has received (i.e. votes) can be explicitly set by the

programmer. The combination of Bayer in view of Oracle 8i anticipates "tabulating in memory cached votes to generate intermediate voting results at specified intervals"

Applicant's second argument that a combination of Bayer and LOC stated in the first office action does not disclose the claimed limitation of "writing the intermediate voting results to a database to determine a final voting result". This limitation is however, disclosed by Bayer. As voting participants vote during a survey, each vote is tallied and written to the database as they vote, and provides a real time intermediate result that is written to the database to determine a final voting result at the end of the survey. This claimed limitation is also disclosed by Bayer in view of Oracle 8i. Oracle discloses that objects can be updated in the cache and, as determined by the programmer, the objects can be written to the database, that is, the data (i.e. votes) contained in the objects is tabulated into the database. Since Bayer discloses Internet voting, it is an obvious combination of Bayer and Oracle to use the object cache disclosed by Oracle to tally intermediate results and then write the intermediate results at specified time intervals into the database to determine a final voting result.

Applicant's third argument is that the object is a non-relational object. However, this limitation is disclosed by Bayer in view of Oracle 8i. Bayer teaches a database accessed by users on the internet for voting and tallying the results of said voting. Oracle 8i discloses objects that utilize the languages of Java and C++ to comprise the object that caches the votes, thus the object is non-relational.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 USC. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1-7 and 9-32** are rejected under 35 USC. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bayer US Patent 6,311,190 in view of Oracle 8i.

**Oracle 8i** is described in the following two references:

"Programmatic Environments for Oracle Objects", Oracle 8i Application Developer's Guide –Fundamentals, copyright 1999, Oracle Corporation, pp.1-18, hereafter referred to as **Reference A**.

"Programmatic Environments", Oracle 8i Application Developer's Guide – Fundamentals, copyright 1999, Oracle Corporation, pp.1-27, hereafter referred to as **Reference B**.

Regarding **Claims 1 & 2**, Bayer teaches:

**receiving votes at the server in response to the survey question** (Figure 13 #98, votes received; column 2 line 39, server provides an addressable voting site); and **tabulating in memory the stored votes accumulated over a predefined time interval to generate intermediate voting results.** (column 17 line 63-65, survey

durations are predefined and are used to determine the generating of intermediate voting results-see also column 18 line 35-38)

**writing the intermediate voting results to the database** (Column 3 line 7—line 12, when a person votes, the network server receives the answers and adds those answers representing votes to records in the database (memory) tallying totals for each response answered. Since the server performs these tasks every time a person votes, it generates an intermediate voting result and writes it to the database.)

**computing a final voting result to the survey question** (Figure 13 #98, votes received and results page constructed of final voting result to the survey question).

Bayer does not teach high density voting over a computer network using an object residing on a server that maintains persistent connections between the object and a database; caching the votes received in a memory cache using the object; using the cached votes in calculating a result.

However, the concept of using objects in a memory cache to provide a buffer to enable high performance access to a database is a well-known concept, as evidenced by Oracle 8i.

Specifically, Oracle 8i teaches the use of objects to:

**providing an object on the server that maintains connections with the database.**

Reference B page 2 paragraph 5 line 3-4, objects maintain connections between the copy in the cache and the corresponding database object--this database object is in memory on the server.

**Caching the votes received in a memory cache using the live event object.**

Reference A, page 2 paragraph 3 line 1, a client side object cache for caching objects in memory;

**tabulating in memory cached votes accumulated over a predefined time interval to generate intermediate voting results;**

Reference A page 2 paragraph 2 line 5, computations can be performed on each object, including but not limited to a plurality of arithmetic operations of data, including tabulation of data (i.e. votes);

Reference A page 4 paragraph 2 line 1-2, objects in memory are pinned for the application to manipulate, including performing the computations mentioned above, and;

Reference A page 5 paragraph 2 line 1, when pinning an object, the duration an object is pinned in memory, that is to have computations performed on the object, can be specified the programmer. That is, the programmer can predefine the intervals in which votes are tabulated in memory.

Reference A page 8 paragraph 2 line 1-4, before an object, including those which tabulate votes, can be updated, it must be pinned in the cache, then, objects which are marked as updated are flushed to the server when the transaction is committed.

Accordingly, a programmer using Oracle 8i can create an object cached in memory to tabulate data (i.e. votes) (objects in cached memory can have computations performed on them, as discussed above), specify intervals that the object will tabulate votes, and at the end of that interval, update the database using a transaction from that object.

Furthermore, Oracle 8i teaches that the use of cached objects provides high performance access to a database (Reference A Page 2 paragraph 4 line 1-2).

Both Bayer and Oracle 8i address utilizing computers to handle manipulating and storing information on databases, and thus both are analogous art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Bayer, as discussed above, with providing an object residing in memory on the server to cache votes and tabulate them in memory to generate intermediate voting results at specified intervals, as taught by Oracle 8i, because it would provide a high performance way to tabulate votes and write voting results to a database.

Bayer and Oracle 8i do not teach persistent connections used to connect an object application to a database.



The examiner takes Official Notice that persistent connections used in object-oriented programming to connect an object application to a database are well known in the art and are provided by most object programming languages, including Java and C++. Persistent connections enable an object-oriented application to always have a connection to a database.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Bayer and Oracle 8i, with maintaining persistent connections between the object and the database, for the purpose of enabling high density interactive voting over a network that maintains persistent connections to a voting database.

Regarding **Claim 3**, Bayer does not teach: **the object being resident in computer memory on the server.**

Oracle 81 teaches: **the object being resident in computer memory on the server** (Reference B page 2 paragraph 5 line 3-4, objects maintain connections between the copy in the cache and the corresponding database object--this database object is in memory on the server.).

Oracle 8i teaches that the use of cached objects provides high performance access (Reference A Page 2 paragraph 4 line 1-2).

Both Bayer and Oracle 8i address utilizing computers to handle manipulating and storing information on databases, and thus both are analogous art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Bayer, as discussed above, with providing an object residing in memory on the server, as taught by Oracle 8i, because it would provide a high performance way to connect to a database.

Regarding **Claim 4**, Bayer does not teach: **having the object establish and maintain at least three persistent connections.**

The examiner takes Official Notice that it is established and well known in the art to program persistent connections in object-oriented applications, whether there be three or more persistent connections, depending on the requirements of the particular application. Programming languages such as Java and C++ have provisions for establishing and maintaining persistent connections in the course of creating object-oriented applications. These connections ensure that an application has a continuous link to either a database or other related applications to ensure accessibility during the course of program execution.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the limitations of Claim 1, as taught by Bayer and Oracle 8i,

with having the object establish and maintain at least three persistent connections with the database, for the purpose of ensuring continuous accessibility to the database during the course of program execution.

Regarding **Claim 5**, Bayer teaches **raw votes** (Figure 3L, answerID field) **cast by each of the voters** (column 9 line 46; each response from a voter is put in table).

Regarding **Claim 6**, Bayer does not teach: **the persistent connections including current voting results obtained using the cached votes.**

Oracle 8i teaches: **obtaining results using information, including votes, that are in an object cache** (Reference A page 2 paragraph 2 line 5, computations can be performed on each object, including but not limited to a plurality of arithmetic operations of data, including tabulation of data (i.e. votes);

Furthermore, Oracle 8i teaches that the use of cached objects provides high performance access (Reference A Page 2 paragraph 4 line 1-2).

Both Bayer and Oracle 8i address utilizing computers to handle manipulating and storing information on databases, and thus both are analogous art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Bayer, as discussed above, with tabulating votes in cached memory to obtain current voting results, as taught by Oracle 8i, because it would provide a high performance way to tabulate votes

Bayer and Oracle 8i do not teach persistent connections.

The examiner takes Official Notice that persistent connections used in object-oriented programming to connect an object application to a database are well known in the art and are provided by most object programming languages, including Java and C++. Persistent connections enable an object-oriented application to always have a connection to a database.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the limitations of Claim 4, as taught by Bayer and Oracle 8i, with using persistent connections to the database, for the purpose of improving performance by performing data tabulation using an object cache with persistent connections to the database.

Regarding **Claim 7**, Bayer teaches: **voting in response to the survey questions asked during an event** (column 6 line 50-51, surveys are programmed to start in advance of certain days-voting is in response to the questions posed during a

survey), **including a definition of the event** (column 6 line 33-34, voting campaign is comprised of one or more surveys; column 6 line 55, survey start dates set in advance).

Regarding **Claim 9**, Bayer teaches: **tabulating the intermediate voting results to compute final voting results** (column 17 line 18-20, for each set of responses, percentages and histogram are calculated to compute final voting results from intermediate results).

Regarding **Claim 10**, Bayer teaches: **tabulating the intermediate voting results continuously to compute final voting results in real time** (Figure 13 #98, receive votes; Figure 14 #124, votes added to totals, column 2 line 19-20, in real time since voters can see results when they vote).

Regarding **Claim 11**, Bayer teaches: **creating the survey question** (column 2 line 60-61, question created based on campaign).

Regarding **Claim 12**, Bayer teaches: **defining an event in which the survey question is asked** (column 6 line 50-51, start date set for survey (i.e. event) in advance; column 6 line 53-54, surveys are set in queue order prior to offering to customers), **and checking a validity of the survey question and the event definition to ensure accuracy** (Figure 7 – add or modify campaign, Figure 8 – add or modify survey question, Figure 9 – add or modify survey).

Bayer teaches that the administrator can check to see if particular questions exist for a survey (column 13 line 21) and can review or modify the question if needed (column 13 line 37, review or modify page for changing question).

Regarding **Claim 13**, Bayer teaches: **determining whether there has been a new survey question created and, if so, then updating the database** (column 13 line 21-23, administrator checks if question exists; column 13 line 29, QuestionType table in database is updated by administrator).

Regarding **Claim 14**, all the limitations are addressed in Claim 1 above, except for: **wherein the object is a non-relational object**.

Bayer does not teach **wherein the object is a non-relational object**.

Oracle teaches **wherein the object is a non-relational object**.

Reference A page 1 paragraph 1 line 3-4, the objects in Oracle 8i are language based, e.g. based on Java, C++ etc.

Furthermore, Oracle 8i teaches that the use of cached, non-relational objects provides high performance access to a database (Reference A Page 2 paragraph 4 line 1-2).

Both Bayer and Oracle 8i address utilizing computers to handle manipulating and storing information on databases, and thus both are analogous art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Bayer, as discussed above, with providing an object residing in memory on the server to cache votes and tabulate them in memory to generate intermediate voting results at specified intervals, as taught by Oracle 8i, because it would provide a high performance way to tabulate votes and write voting results to a database.

Regarding **Claim 15**, Bayer does not teach: **the object contains some of the voting data as well as procedures and instructions for manipulating at least some of the data.**

Oracle 8i teaches: **that the object contains some of the voting data** (Reference A page 2 paragraph 3 line 6, objects can be updated, i.e they contain data, including voting data) **and that the object contains procedures and instructions for manipulating data** (reference A page 2 paragraph 3 lines 2-7, Oracle 8i provides support for navigational access of objects, including containing procedures and instructions for creating, updating and deleting objects in the cache, i.e. data).

Oracle 8i teaches that the use of cached, non-relational objects provides high performance access (Reference A Page 2 paragraph 4 line 1-2).

Both Bayer and Oracle 8i address utilizing computers to handle manipulating and storing information on databases, and thus both are analogous art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Bayer, as discussed above, with the object contains some of the voting data as well as procedures and instructions for manipulating at least some of the data, as taught by Oracle 8i, because it would provide a high performance way to tabulate votes and write voting results to a database.

Regarding **Claim 16**, Bayer teaches: **tabulating the final voting result using the intermediate voting result** (Figure 13 #98, receive votes; Figure 14 #124, votes added to totals, column 17 line 18-21, results calculated for each voter from intermediate results).

Regarding **Claim 17**, Bayer teaches: **tabulating the final voting result in real time** (Figure 13 #98, receive votes; Figure 14 #124, votes added to totals, column 17 line 18-21, results calculated for each voter from intermediate results in real time).

Regarding **Claims 18 and 19**, Bayer does not teach **one**, per Claim 18, or **three**, per Claim 19, **persistent connection(s) between the object and database that is maintained by the object**.



The examiner takes Official Notice that it is established and well known in the art to program persistent connections in object-oriented applications, whether there be three or more persistent connections, depending on the requirements of the particular application. Programming languages such as Java and C++ have provisions for establishing and maintaining persistent connections in the course of creating object-oriented applications. These connections ensure that an application has a continuous link to either a database or other related applications to ensure accessibility to the application or database during the course of program execution.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the limitations of Claim 14, as taught by Bayer and LOC, with having the object establish and maintain at least three persistent connections, for the purpose of ensuring continuous accessibility to the database during the course of program execution.

Regarding **Claim 20**, Bayer teaches: **an authoring system that enables a user to define an event** (column 6 line 50-51, start date set for survey as part of campaign in advance; column 6 line 53-54, surveys are set in queue order prior to offering to customers) **and create polling questions associated with the event** (Figure 4 #52, add/modify campaign; Figure 4 #56, add/modify question) **for distribution to the voters** (Figure 2A, sample webpage).

Regarding **Claim 21**, Bayer teaches: **a staging component that copies the event definition and polling questions to the database** (column 3 line 2-3, elements of survey webpages, including questions, are stored in a database; Figure 16A, campaign database table structure that defines campaigns and associated surveys; column 3 line 3-5, administrator can modify/create campaign information, see also Figure 4 #52).

Regarding **Claim 22**, all the limitations are addressed in Claim 1 above, except for: **the intermediate voting results are used to compute the final voting results in real time.**

Bayer teaches:

**the intermediate voting results are used to compute the final voting results in real time.**

Column 17 line 62-column 18 line 2, a voter can select to view the final voting results of any previous voting campaign. This is done by specifying a date range. Once the voter enters their selection, the result is returned in real time over the on-line networked interface taught by Bayer.

Regarding **Claim 23**, Bayer does not teach: **a vote cache that receives and caches at least some of the voting data from the object.**

Oracle 8i teaches: **a vote cache that receives and caches at least some of the voting data from the object** (reference A page 2 paragraph 3 line 6, objects in cache can be updated, including for receiving data (i.e. votes) –the cache the objects are in provides memory for storing the vote data. The objects in cache memory that Oracle 8i teaches contain memory for receiving and storing data as well as instructions for manipulating that data.)

Oracle 8i teaches that the use of cached, non-relational objects provides high performance access (Reference A Page 2 paragraph 4 line 1-2).

Both Bayer and Oracle 8i address utilizing computers to handle manipulating and storing information on databases, and thus both are analogous art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Bayer, as discussed above, with a vote cache that receives and caches at least some of the voting data from the object, as taught by Oracle 8i, because it would provide a high performance way to tabulate votes and write voting results to a database.

Regarding **Claim 24**, Bayer does not teach: **a processor that tabulates the cached voting data from the vote cache to generate intermediate voting results.**

Oracle 8i teaches: **a processor that tabulates the cached voting data from the vote cache to generate intermediate voting results** (Reference A page 1 paragraph 2 line 1-2, Oracle runs on a server that inherently contains a processor for tabulating and operating on the objects in the cache, including data for voting – see page 2 paragraph 3 line 6).

Oracle 8i teaches that the use of cached, non-relational objects provides high performance access (Reference A Page 2 paragraph 4 line 1-2).

Both Bayer and Oracle 8i address utilizing computers to handle manipulating and storing information on databases, and thus both are analogous art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Bayer, as discussed above, with a processor that tabulates the cached voting data from the vote cache to generate intermediate voting results, as taught by Oracle 8i, because it would provide a high performance way to tabulate votes and write voting results to a database.

Regarding **Claim 25**, Bayer teaches: **tabulating the intermediate voting results continuously to compute final voting results in real time** (Figure 13 #98, receive votes; Figure 14 #124, votes added to totals, column 2 line 19-20, in real time since votes can see results when they vote).

**Claims 26 and 27** recite limitations similar to those cited in the rejection of **Claims 1, 14 and 15** above, and are therefore rejected under the same rationale.

**Claim 28** recites limitations similar to those cited in the rejection of **Claim 23** above, and is therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding **Claim 29**, Bayer teaches:

**writing each of the received votes to the database to allow cross-tabulation of demographic data.**

Figure 14 #126, a country summary is build to allow cross-tabulation of data from different countries (i.e. demographic data).

Regarding **Claim 30**, Bayer does not teach:

**wherein the predefined time interval is approximately fifteen seconds.**

Oracle 8i teaches:

**wherein the predefined time interval is approximately fifteen seconds.**

Reference A page 5 paragraph 2 line 1, time durations for pinning objects in memory can be specified in a predetermined way, including for fifteen seconds. The choice of 15 seconds is a design choice and is anticipated by the functionality provided by Oracle 8i.

Oracle 8i teaches that the use of cached, non-relational objects provides high performance access (Reference A Page 2 paragraph 4 line 1-2).

Both Bayer and Oracle 8i address utilizing computers to handle manipulating and storing information on databases, and thus both are analogous art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Bayer, as discussed above, with wherein the predefined time interval is approximately fifteen seconds, as taught by Oracle 8i, because it would provide a high performance way to tabulate votes and write voting results to a database.

Regarding **Claim 31**, Bayer teaches:

**tabulating in memory a plurality of the intermediate voting results written to the database such that the final voting results are updated;**

column 30 line 57-60, voting data is stored in memory as voters cast votes, i.e. the system tabulates in memory a plurality of the intermediate voting results such that the final voting results are updated.

**and writing the updated final voting results to the database.**

column 30 line 64-67, the final voting results are added (i.e. written) to the database.

Regarding **Claim 32**, Bayer does not teach:

**further comprising updating the final voting results approximately every ten seconds.**

Oracle teaches:

**further comprising updating the final voting results approximately every ten seconds.**

Reference A page 5 paragraph 2 line 1, time durations for pinning objects in memory can be specified in a predetermined way, including for ten seconds. The choice of 10 seconds is a design choice and is anticipated by the functionality provided by Oracle 8i.

Oracle 8i teaches that the use of cached, non-relational objects provides high performance access (Reference A Page 2 paragraph 4 line 1-2).

Both Bayer and Oracle 8i address utilizing computers to handle manipulating and storing information on databases, and thus both are analogous art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Bayer, as discussed above, with wherein the predefined time interval for updating the final voting results is approximately ten seconds, as taught by Oracle 8i, because it would provide a high performance way to tabulate votes and write voting results to a database.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 20040073631 by Keorkunian discloses a System and method for anonymous observation and use of premium content.

US 20030120619 by Osborn discloses optimizing storage and retrieval of monitoring data.

US 6317778 by Dias discloses a system and method for replacement and duplication of objects in a cache.



US 6304879 by Sobeski discloses a dynamic data cache for object-oriented computing environments.

US 6178461 by Chan discloses a cache-based compaction technique for internet browsing using similar objects in client cache as reference objects.

US 6128627 by Mattis discloses consistent data storage in an object cache.

US 6128623 by Mattis discloses a high performance object cache.

US 5884316 by Bernstein discloses an implicit session context system with object state cache.

US 5872969 by Copeland discloses a system and method for efficiently synchronizing cache and persistent data in an object oriented transaction processing system.

US 5727203 by Hapner discloses a method and apparatus for managing a database in a distributed object operating environment using persistent and transient cache.

US 5287507 by Hamilton discloses a method and apparatus for portable object handles that use local caches.

Getting to know Oracle 8i, Release 8.1.5, "Release 8.0 New Features and Options", copyright 1999 Oracle Corporation, pp.1-11.

Davison, Brian, "A Survey of Proxy Cache Evaluation Techniques", March 28, 1999, pp.1-12.

Neema, Farid, "Storage Caching Techniques", October 1997, pp.1-3.

Web.archive.org, cacheflow.com, May 11, 1998, "Resource Library – What is Caching?", pp.1-2.

Web.archive.org, cacheflow.com, May 11, 1998, "Resource Library – High-Performance Web Caching White Paper", pp.1-8.

www.databasejournal.com, "Introduction to Databases for Web", November 23, 1998, part 4, pp.1-9.

Webster, John, "Does Oracle Really Do It All?", InternetWeek, November 28, 2000, pp.1-3.

Oracle 8i™ Enterprise Edition, Technical Data Sheet, November 1999, pp.1-24.

Fromhein, Dirk, Relational Object Framework for Java Beans, "UK Nextstep Mailing List", January 12, 1998, pp.1-3.

Scholl, Mark; Schek, Hans-Joerg, "A Relational Object Model", 1990, Proceedings of the third international conference on database theory, pp.1-3.

Oracle 8™ Enterprise Edition Release 8.0, "New Features Overview", June 1997, copyright Oracle Corporation, pp.1-12.

Rauch, Steven, "Manage Data from Myriad Sources with the Universal Data Access Interfaces", September, 1997, Microsoft.com/msj/0997/universaldata.aspx, pp.1-19.

Esposito, Dino, "With Further ADO: Coding Active Data Objects 2.0 with Visual Studio 6.0, 1998, Microsoft.com/msj/0299/ado20/ado20.aspx, pp. 1-32.

Web.archive.org, ircache.net, "2. Web Caching – Basics", November 4, 1999, pp.1-4.

Web.archive.org, objectplanet.com, "Survey Web Survey Software", November 27, 1999, pp.1-2.

"City uses Spatial Direct on Oracle 8i", March 3, 2000, safe.com/news/2000/63/, pp.1-2.

Dobson, Rick, "Data binding in Dynamic HTML", March 98, DBMS, v11, n3, p.47(5), Dialog 02176068 20527056.

Allen, Doug, "Caches Serve up Response Time –To Reduce WAN Bandwidth and increase Web Response Time (well, Duh!), consider giving Content Delivery Providers and caching a try." Dec 1, 2000, Network Magazine, p.64, Dialog 08103606 67533183.

Govatos, Greg, "The end of the worldwide wait (caching)", Feb 200, Communication News, v37, n2, p.30, Dialog 07071817 59584642.

Trupin, Joshua, "Putting your OLE controls to work with Microsoft Access, Visual Basic and C++", Feb 1995, Microsoft Systems Journal, v10, n2, p45(11), Dialog 01725063 16018379.

Gladney, Henry M, "A storage subsystem for image and records management", 1993, IBM Systems Journal, v32n3, pp.512-540, Dialog 00759577 94-08969.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan G. Sterrett whose telephone number is (571)

Art Unit: 3623

272-6881. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00AM - 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JGS  
7/20/2005

JGS

*Susanna Diaz*  
**SUSANNA M. DIAZ**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

*AU 3623*